

Heavy Dirac fermions in a graphene/topological insulator hetero-junction

Wendong Cao,¹ Rui-Xing Zhang,² Peizhe Tang,³ Gang Yang,²
Jorge Sofo,² Wenhui Duan,^{1,4,5} and Chao-Xing Liu^{2,*}

¹*State Key Laboratory of Low-Dimensional Quantum Physics,
Department of Physics, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China*

²*Department of Physics, The Pennsylvania State University,
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802-6300, USA*

³*Department of Physics, McCullough Building,
Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305-4045, USA*

⁴*Institute for Advanced Study, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China*

⁵*Collaborative Innovation Center of Quantum Matter, Beijing 100084, China*
(Dated: March 1, 2016)

The low energy physics of both graphene and surface states of three-dimensional topological insulators is described by gapless Dirac fermions with linear dispersion. In this work, we predict the emergence of a “heavy” Dirac fermion in a graphene/topological insulator hetero-junction, where the linear term almost vanishes and the corresponding energy dispersion becomes highly non-linear. By combining *ab initio* calculations and an effective low-energy model, we show explicitly how strong hybridization between Dirac fermions in graphene and the surface states of topological insulators can reduce the Fermi velocity of Dirac fermions. Due to the negligible linear term, interaction effects will be greatly enhanced and can drive “heavy” Dirac fermion states into the half quantum Hall state with non-zero Hall conductance.

I. INTRODUCTION

Two-dimensional Dirac physics has aroused great interest in condensed matter physics ever since the discovery of graphene^{1–3} and topological insulators (TIs)^{4–6} due to its importance in both fundamental physics and device applications. In graphene, gapless Dirac cones exist at the momenta K and K' point in the Brillion zone (BZ) with a large Fermi velocity $\simeq 1 \times 10^6$ m/s, which is about 1/300 of the speed of light⁷, and results in a high mobility for electron transport in graphene. Due to its high mobility, graphene is believed to possess the potential in the applications involving fast speed electronic devices^{8–10}. On the other hand, when a gap (mass) is opened for Dirac cones, the so-called “parity anomaly”, which was first known in high energy physics¹¹, can occur¹² and lead to a large variety of topological states, including the quantum anomalous Hall (QAH) effect¹² and the quantum spin Hall (QSH) effect¹³, in graphene. Furthermore, it was predicted that these topological states in graphene can be spontaneously induced by interaction, leading to the so-called “topological Mott insulators”¹⁴. However, due to the large Fermi velocity, the density of states vanishes rapidly near the Dirac cone, and the critical interaction strength is relatively large. Thus, the reduction of Fermi velocity in Dirac fermions (or equivalently a “heavy” Dirac fermion) is valuable for exploring new topological states in the Dirac systems.

In this work, we explore Dirac physics in a hetero-junction with graphene on top of a TI. The QSH effect with a large energy gap has been predicted for graphene coupled to TI thin films^{15,16}. Here we focus on the case of graphene coupled to a *single* surface state of a three dimensional TI, which can be realized in experiments when the thickness of the TI is large enough so that the topological surface states on opposite surfaces are decoupled. In this case, we find that due to the strong hybridization between the four Dirac cones from graphene (two valleys and two spins) and one Dirac cone from the topological surface state, four of the resulting states will be gapped while one remains gapless with the Fermi velocity significantly reduced. By constructing an effective model of this system based on first principles calculations, we explore the underlying physical reason why the linear dispersion relation term is so small. As a consequence, the “heavy” Dirac fermion has a much larger density of states near the Dirac point, and a relatively small

interaction can drive the system into a gaped topological phase with non-zero Hall conductance (parity anomaly). Below, we will first construct an effective model for this hetero-junction that reproduces the physics observed in our first-principles calculations, and then study the effects of interactions at the mean field level.

II. EFFECTIVE MODEL FOR GRAPHENE/TOPOLOGICAL INSULATOR HETERO-JUNCTIONS

Firstly, we perform *ab initio* calculations for a hetero-junction with graphene on a Sb_2Te_3 film with eight quintuple (QL) layers, as shown in Fig. 1(a). Due to the lattice mismatch between graphene and Sb_2Te_3 films (substrate), the slab model used in this calculation contains one unit cell of Sb_2Te_3 films¹⁷, whose in-plane lattice constant corresponds to that of the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ supercell of graphene with 0.3% compression. The top view of the most stable configuration is shown in Fig. 1(b) in which the topmost Te atom locates at the center of the hexagonal ring of graphene¹⁶. From our calculations, it is found that the equilibrium distance between graphene and Sb_2Te_3 is 3.456 Å and the binding energy is 41.9 meV per carbon atom. Since the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ supercell of graphene is used in our simulation, the BZ of the hetero-junction is folded, and reduced to one third of the original BZ of the intrinsic graphene (the original and folded BZs are shown in Fig. 1(c)), and thus the K_0 and K'_0 in the original BZ are mapped into Γ in the folded BZ. Consequently, the Dirac cones from both graphene and TI appear at the same momentum Γ , and we only need to focus on the low energy physics around the Γ point. From the *ab initio* calculations, the band structure of the hetero-junction is shown in Fig. 1(d) and its low energy bands are zoomed in (dotted lines) in Fig. 1(e). Spin-orbit coupling (SOC) is included in the calculations and more details about *ab initio* calculation method can be found in the appendix A. In Fig. 1(e), via analyzing the wave functions at the Γ point around the Fermi level, we find that the bottom surface states of TIs has no hybridization with graphene and contribute to the gapless Dirac cone labelled by blue-dotted lines in Fig. 1(e). The bands labelled by green-dotted lines originate from the hybridization of energy bands in graphene and top surface states of TIs. Therefore, we focus on these energy bands (marked by the green-dotted lines) and unveil underlying physics for the “heavy” Dirac Fermion.




FIG. 1: (a) Side view of the hetero-junction with graphene and the top few atomic layers of Sb₂Te₃. (b) Top view of the hetero-junction for graphene and the two topmost atomic layers of Sb₂Te₃. The black solid rhombus is a unit cell and two in-plane lattice vectors are $\{\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2\}$. The three red arrows label three hopping processes with the amplitudes $\{t_1, t_2, t_3\}$ between nearest carbon atoms in graphene. (c) The folded Brillouin zone of the unit cell in (b) are denoted by solid lines and high-symmetric points (Γ , M and K) are labelled. K_0 and K'_0 are also presented in the original Brillouin zone of the pristine graphene (dashed lines). (d) Calculated band structure along the high-symmetric lines $K - \Gamma - M$. (e) Low-energy band structure around the Γ point from *ab initio* calculation (green dots) and the corresponding effective Hamiltonian H_{full} in Eq.[2] (red lines). Φ^1_{Rashba} , $\Phi^1_{Kekulé}$, Φ_{Dirac} , $\Phi^2_{Kekulé}$, Φ^2_{Rashba} labels bands that we are interested in. The blue dots represent the bottom surface states, which are decoupled from graphene.

To understand the hybridization between these Dirac fermions, we first neglect the topological surface states of Sb₂Te₃ films and consider only the p_z orbitals of graphene under the environment of the Sb₂Te₃ substrate. For intrinsic graphene, there are two sub-lattice sites in one unit cell and the low energy physics can be effectively described by a two-dimensional Dirac type of Hamiltonian around K_0 and K'_0 in the original BZ³. In contrast, due to the influence of the substrate, one unit cell of this hetero-junction contains a hexagon (benzene ring) with six equivalent carbon sites and the hopping terms between them could be described by three hopping parameters, denoted as t_1 , t_2 and t_3 in Fig. 1(b). Therefore, a 6×6 tight-binding model³ on the basis of $|p_z, n\rangle$, $n = 1, \dots, 6$ is used to describe this system (see Eq. [B.1] in the appendix B) in which, for the basis $|p_z, n\rangle$, p_z is the atomic orbital and n represents the site index.

For convenience, we perform a unitary transformation to change the basis into eigenstates of the rotation operator. We consider the six-fold rotation operation C_6 and the corresponding rotation symmetric basis are denoted as $C_6|L'_z\rangle = \exp(-iL'_z \frac{2\pi}{3})|L'_z\rangle$, where $L'_z = \pm 2, \pm 1, 0, 3$ labels six eigenstates for C_6 rotation. (The detailed form of unitary transformation, as well as the basis $|L'_z\rangle$, is given by Eq. [B.2] in the appendix B and the form of the effective Hamiltonian

expanded around $\mathbf{k} = 0$ is given by Eq. [B.3] in the appendix B). We emphasize that six-fold rotation symmetry only exists in pristine graphene ($t_1 = t_2 = t_3$), in which two gapless Dirac fermions appear under the basis $|L'_z = \pm 2\rangle$ and $|L'_z = \pm 1\rangle$ and the states labeled by $|L'_z = 0\rangle$ and $|L'_z = 3\rangle$ are gapped. This is because the states $|L'_z = \pm 2\rangle$ and $|L'_z = \pm 1\rangle$ originate from the states in the K_0 and K'_0 while the states $|L'_z = 0\rangle$ and $|L'_z = 3\rangle$ from those at Γ_0 in the original BZ. Therefore, in the following discussion, we only focus on the basis $|L'_z = \pm 2\rangle$ and $|L'_z = \pm 1\rangle$. Due to SOC, the orbital angular momentum is not a good quantum number and the total angular momentum should be considered. Thus, these eigenstates can be labeled by $|J'_z = -\frac{3}{2}, \uparrow\rangle, |-\frac{1}{2}, \uparrow\rangle, |\frac{5}{2}, \uparrow\rangle, |\frac{3}{2}, \uparrow\rangle, |\frac{3}{2}, \downarrow\rangle, |\frac{1}{2}, \downarrow\rangle, |-\frac{5}{2}, \downarrow\rangle$ and $|-\frac{3}{2}, \downarrow\rangle$.

Due to the hybridizations with the Sb_2Te_3 substrate, the six-fold rotation symmetry C_6 is broken down to three-fold rotation C_3 , which is known as Kekulé modulation¹⁸. In this case, we may re-label our basis states $|L'_z = \pm 2\rangle$ and $|L'_z = \pm 1\rangle$ by the eigenvalues of C_3 rotation, denoted as $|L_z, \eta\rangle$, where $C_3|L_z, \eta\rangle = \exp(-iL_z\frac{2\pi}{3})|L_z, \eta\rangle$ with $L_z = \pm 1$, $\eta = \pm 1$. The index η is introduced to distinguish two degenerate states with the same L_z . The explicit form of $|L_z, \eta\rangle$ in the basis set of $\{|p_z, n\rangle\}$ and more details about the additional index η can be found in the appendix C. Under the basis $|+1, +1\rangle, |-1, +1\rangle, |-1, -1\rangle, |+1, -1\rangle$ (or equivalently $|L'_z = -2\rangle, |-1\rangle, |2\rangle, |1\rangle$), the effective Hamiltonian is written as

$$H_{G,4\times 4} = \begin{pmatrix} -\Delta\cos\theta & \hbar v_f^G k_+ & 0 & \Delta\sin\theta \\ \hbar v_f^G k_- & +\Delta\cos\theta & \Delta\sin\theta & 0 \\ 0 & \Delta\sin\theta & -\Delta\cos\theta & -\hbar v_f^G k_- \\ \Delta\sin\theta & 0 & -\hbar v_f^G k_+ & +\Delta\cos\theta \end{pmatrix} \quad (1)$$

where v_f^G is the Fermi velocity of graphene, $k_{\pm} = k_x \pm i k_y$, $\Delta = \sqrt{t_1^2 + t_2^2 + t_3^2 - t_1 t_2 - t_2 t_3 - t_3 t_1}$ and $\tan\theta = \sqrt{3}(t_1 - t_2)/(t_1 + t_2 - 2t_3)$. The Kekulé modulation terms, described by two independent parameters Δ and θ , can lead to a gap opening with the size of 2Δ for both Dirac cones.

When SOC is considered, the basis set $\{|L_z, \eta\rangle\}$ should be enlarged and L_z is replaced by the total angular momentum along the z direction ($J_z = L_z + S_z$). The new basis states for graphene take the form of $|J_z = \frac{3}{2}, \eta = +1\rangle, |-\frac{1}{2}, +1\rangle, |-\frac{1}{2}, -1\rangle, |\frac{3}{2}, -1\rangle, |-\frac{3}{2}, -1\rangle, |\frac{1}{2}, -1\rangle, |\frac{1}{2}, +1\rangle$ and $|-\frac{3}{2}, +1\rangle$. Given the coupling with the substrate, the full low-energy effective Hamiltonian around the Γ point is written as

$$H_{full} = \begin{pmatrix} H_{GG} & H_{GS} \\ H_{GS}^\dagger & H_{SS} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2)$$

Here H_{GG} is the Hamiltonian of graphene which takes spin into account. The detailed form of H_{GG} is given by Eq. [B.7] in the appendix B. H_{SS} describes topological surface states on top surface of Sb_2Te_3 films and is given by

$$H_{SS} = \mu^S + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i\hbar v_f^S k_- \\ -i\hbar v_f^S k_+ & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (3)$$

where v_f^S is the Fermi velocity of top surface states, and μ^S denotes the corresponding chemical potential. The basis states for topological surface states can also be labelled by their eigenvalues of J_z , $\{|J_z^S = \pm\frac{1}{2}\rangle\}$. Furthermore, we can construct the hybridization Hamiltonian H_{GS} between graphene and TIs directly from the hopping process between the p_z orbitals of carbon atoms and all the p orbitals of Se and Te atoms. The explicit form of H_{GS} is shown in Eq. [B.16] in the appendix B.

With the effective Hamiltonian H_{full} in Eq. 2, we calculate the energy spectrum of graphene/TIs hetero-structure, as shown by red lines in Fig. 1(e). The corresponding parameters for H_{full} are listed in the Table B.1 of the appendix B. The effective model reproduces well the band structure from first-principles calculations (dotted-green lines), especially for the

bands labeled by Φ_{Rashba}^1 , $\Phi_{Kekulé}^1$, $\Phi_{Kekulé}^2$ and Φ_{Rashba}^2 in Fig. 1(e). The bands Φ_{Rashba}^1 and Φ_{Rashba}^2 mainly come from the hybridization between the topological surface states $\{|J_z^S = \pm \frac{1}{2}\rangle\}$ and graphene states $|\frac{1}{2}, \pm 1\rangle$ and $|\frac{1}{2}, \pm 1\rangle$ (or equivalently $|J'_z = -\frac{1}{2}, \uparrow\rangle$ and $|J'_z = \frac{1}{2}, \downarrow\rangle$). Due to strong SOC in TIs, these bands reveal strong Rashba type of spin splitting and thus are labeled by “Rashba” bands. Both $\Phi_{Kekulé}^1$ and $\Phi_{Kekulé}^2$ originate from four graphene states $|\frac{3}{2}, \pm 1\rangle$ and $|\frac{3}{2}, \pm 1\rangle$ (or equivalently $|J'_z = \pm \frac{3}{2}, \uparrow(\downarrow)\rangle$). It should be noted that all these four states can hybridize with each other since the C_6 rotation symmetry is broken to the C_3 rotation symmetry due to the Kekulé modulation (thus dubbed as “Kekulé” bands). The gap between $\Phi_{Kekulé}^1$ and $\Phi_{Kekulé}^2$ requires the Kekulé modulation and thus is smaller than that between Φ_{Rashba}^1 and Φ_{Rashba}^2 , which only depends on the coupling strength between graphene and TIs.

Within the gap between $\Phi_{Kekulé}^1$ and $\Phi_{Kekulé}^2$, there are other two bands, labeled by Φ_{Dirac} , which are dominated by the states $|\frac{1}{2}, +1\rangle$ and $|\frac{1}{2}, -1\rangle$ (or correspondingly $|J'_z = -\frac{5}{2}, \downarrow\rangle$ and $|J'_z = \frac{5}{2}, \uparrow\rangle$). For these two bands, the effective model only recovers the energy dispersion close to the Γ point. For larger momentum, a highly nonlinear behaviour can be observed from the first-principles calculations and suggests that higher momentum terms are dominant for these two bands. To get an effective description for these two bands, we apply the Löwdin perturbation theory to the full Hamiltonian H_{full} (2) and project it into the low-energy subspace of Φ_{Dirac} . Up to the third order in the momentum k , we obtain the following two-band effective Hamiltonian:

$$H_{eff}(k) = (C_2 k^2 + C_3) \hat{z} \cdot (\vec{\sigma} \times \mathbf{k}) - \frac{C_1}{2} (k_+^3 + k_-^3) \sigma_z + (e_0 - C_0 k^2) I_{2 \times 2} \quad (4)$$

where $e_0 = 0.01698$ eV, $C_0 = 116.1186$ eV, $C_1 = 32.2418$ eV, $C_2 = 936.4909$ eV, $C_3 = 0.02039$ eV are obtained by fitting to the energy dispersion. $\vec{\sigma} = (\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z)$ are the Pauli matrices. For further discussions, we can ignore the identity terms and re-write the effective Hamiltonian in a nice form: $H_{eff} = \sum_{i=x,y,z} d_i(k) \sigma_i$ with $d_x = (C_2 k^2 + C_3) k_y$, $d_y = -(C_2 k^2 + C_3) k_x$, $d_z = -\frac{C_1}{2} (k_+^3 + k_-^3)$. In Eq. 4, the parameter C_3 describes the linear dispersion and corresponds to the Fermi velocity around 1.3×10^4 m · s⁻¹, which is greatly reduced compared to its original value 3×10^5 m · s⁻¹ (the Fermi velocity of TI surface states). This estimate quantitatively reveals that the Fermi velocity of the bands Φ_{Dirac} is quite small and the dominating terms in Eq. (4) are the cubic terms.

The heavy Dirac fermion of Φ_{Dirac} can be physically understood from the form of their wave functions. One notices that the spin components of $|\frac{1}{2}, +1\rangle$ and $|\frac{1}{2}, -1\rangle$ are opposite, so the coupling between them has to involve a spin-flip process. Since SOC in graphene is negligible¹⁹, this coupling can only originate from the hybridization with the TI surface states. Therefore, the interactions between $|\frac{1}{2}, -1\rangle$ and $|\frac{1}{2}, +1\rangle$ in graphene can only be mediated by the interlayer coupling between graphene and the topological surface states through second order (or higher order) perturbations. A detailed analysis of the possible coupling processes is shown in the appendix D. We conclude that the weak coupling between $|\frac{1}{2}, +1\rangle$ and $|\frac{1}{2}, -1\rangle$ makes the resulting Dirac fermion much heavier than that of the TI surface states.

III. INTERACTION EFFECT IN GRAPHENE/TOPOLOGICAL INSULATOR HETERO-JUNCTIONS

Based on the above low-energy effective Hamiltonian (4), we will next discuss interaction effect in this system. We consider the Hubbard repulsion interaction and write the whole Hamiltonian in the real space as

$$H = \sum_{\langle r, r' \rangle} \Psi^\dagger(r) H_0(r, r') \Psi(r') + U \sum_r \psi_1^\dagger(r) \psi_1(r) \psi_2^\dagger(r) \psi_2(r) \quad (5)$$

where the spinor $\Psi(r) = (\psi_1(r), \psi_2(r))^T$ is written under the basis $|\frac{1}{2}, +1\rangle$ and $|\frac{1}{2}, -1\rangle$. Based on the mean field approximation (details are shown in the appendix E), the above interaction




FIG. 2: Critical interaction strength evolving with the coefficient of linear term C_3 is plotted. The solid blue (orange dashed) line shows the evolution of U_c^z (U_c^y) with C_3 . Two red dots shows the U_c required for an isolated TI surface state or a graphene/TI junction. The vertical axis is for U_c times sample area, so the unit will depend on the sample size.

Hamiltonian can be decomposed into the form

$$H = \sum_k \Psi^\dagger(k) [H_{eff}(k) - (\Delta_y \sigma_y + \Delta_z \sigma_z)] \Psi(k) + \frac{1}{U} (\Delta_y^2 + \Delta_z^2) \quad (6)$$

where the order parameters $\Delta_{y,z}$ are defined as follows:

$$\Delta_y = \frac{U}{2} A \langle \Psi^\dagger \sigma_y \Psi \rangle, \quad \Delta_z = \frac{U}{2} A \langle \Psi^\dagger \sigma_z \Psi \rangle. \quad (7)$$

A is the surface area of the sample. Thus, we find two types of order parameters leading to the gap opening of heavy Dirac fermions in the hetero-structure. These order parameters Δ_y and Δ_z both break time reversal symmetry, which leads to spontaneous half quantum Hall effect of the Dirac fermions. In addition, Δ_y also breaks three-fold in-plane rotational symmetry and can be recognized as a type of nematic phases.

By minimizing the free energy, we obtain the self-consistent equations for order parameters Δ_i ($i = y, z$)

$$\frac{1}{U} \Delta_i = \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \frac{\Delta_i - d_i(k)}{\sqrt{d_x(k)^2 + (d_y(k) - \Delta_y)^2 + (d_z(k) - \Delta_z)^2}}. \quad (8)$$

We emphasize that when the coefficient of linear term C_3 vanishes, the density of states (DOS) in the above Eq. (8) is divergent at the Dirac point, thus leading to an instability for heavy Dirac fermions. An infinitesimal interaction U will yield a gap and drive the system into the ordered phase. With a finite but small C_3 , the DOS vanishes at the Dirac point, and thus, a finite interaction is needed to open a gap at the Dirac point. The phase boundary is characterized by the critical interaction strength U_c , under which the order parameters take the limit $\lim_{U \rightarrow U_c} \Delta_i = 0^+$. The analytical expression of U_c is given by (see appendix F for a detailed derivation)

$$\frac{1}{U_c^i} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{d_x(k)^2 + d_y(k)^2 + d_z(k)^2}} - \frac{d_i(k)^2}{[d_x(k)^2 + d_y(k)^2 + d_z(k)^2]^{\frac{3}{2}}} \right]. \quad (9)$$

Here we arrived at two inequivalent self-consistent equations for U_c^i ($i = y, z$) and the physical phase boundary happens for $U = \min\{U_c^y, U_c^z\}$.

The dependence of the critical interaction strength U_c^i as a function of C_3 is shown in Fig. 2. We find that U_c^z (plotted in a solid blue line) is always smaller than U_c^y (plotted in an orange dashed line). Therefore, the blue line in Fig. 2 determines the phase transition line in the real system. This numerical calculation also verifies our previous expectation that (i) when C_3 is zero, the required U_c is also zero, and (ii) as C_3 increases, U_c also increases from zero and a finite interaction strength is required to drive the system into the ordered phase. In Fig. 2, we also show the U_c for both an isolated TI surface state ($C_3 = 0.43$ eV) and a graphene/TI junction ($C_3 = 0.02$ eV) in red dots. One can see that the required critical interaction for ordered phases is almost one order of magnitude smaller in graphene/TI junctions, compared to that in pristine graphene.

IV. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this work, we demonstrate the existence of a heavy Dirac fermion with a small Fermi velocity and highly non-linear energy dispersion in the hetero-junction of graphene and a TI film, and unveil the underlying physical origins of the strong coupling between the graphene bands and the topological surface states of TI films, by combining *ab initio* calculations with the low energy effective models. Due to the significant reduction of Fermi velocity, the low-energy states in graphene/TI junctions are more unstable in the presence of interactions. One may notice that the energy dispersion from first-principles calculations shows a larger non-linearity compared to that for the effective model in Fig. 1. This suggests that an even larger DOS appears near the Dirac cone and the corresponding critical interaction strength would be further reduced. The decreased Fermi velocity and the enhanced DOS of the Dirac fermion can be verified in experiments of angle-resolved photo-emission spectroscopy²⁰⁻²² and scanning tunneling spectroscopy^{23,24}. If the interaction effect in this system is strong enough, topological electromagnetic effect^{25,26} can be spontaneously realized in this hetero-junction and one dimensional chiral fermions are expected to exist at the domain wall of this gaped phase.

V. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We would like to thank Nitin Samarth and Jun Zhu for the helpful discussions. W.C. and W.D. acknowledge the support from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 11334006). C.-X.L. acknowledges the support from Office of Naval Research (Grant No. N00014-15-1-2675).

Appendix

A. Details of *ab initio* calculations

The calculations were carried out by using density-functional theory (DFT) with a plane wave basis set and the frozen projector augmented wave method for the treatment of the core electrons^{27,28}, as implemented in the Vienna *ab initio* simulation package²⁹. A plane wave basis set with a kinetic energy cutoff of 450 eV was used. Before the band structure calculation, graphene and the four topmost atomic layers of the substrate are fully relaxed until the residual forces are less than 1×10^{-3} eV/Å. During the relaxation process, the van der Waals correction of DFT-D2 method of Grimme is included³⁰. With spin-orbit coupling included, the band structure was calculated along high symmetry lines near the Γ point. In both geometry optimization and electronic calculation, the Monkhorst-Pack k points are $15 \times 15 \times 1$.

B. Explicit form of the effective Hamiltonian H

With p_z orbitals of the six carbon atoms being the basis states $\{|p_z, n\rangle, n = 1, \dots, 6\}$, the spinless tight-binding Hamiltonian of graphene is

$$H_{tb} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & t_2 & 0 & t_3 e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot (\mathbf{a}_2 - \mathbf{a}_1)} & 0 & t_1 \\ 0 & t_1 & 0 & t_3 e^{-i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{a}_1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & t_2 & 0 & t_3 e^{-i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{a}_2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & t_1 & 0 & 0 \\ h.c. & & & 0 & t_2 & 0 \\ & & & & & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where the index n for carbon atoms can be seen in Fig. 1. To reveal the low-energy Dirac physics, we transform the basis states to $\{|L'_z = \pm 2, \pm 1, 0, 3\rangle\}$, where $C_6|L'_z\rangle = \omega^{-2L'_z}|L'_z\rangle$, C_6 is the six-fold rotation operator and $\omega = \exp(\frac{i\pi}{6})$. The basis transformation matrix $U_{6 \times 6}$ is

$$\begin{pmatrix} |-2\rangle & |-1\rangle & |0\rangle & |1\rangle & |2\rangle & |3\rangle \\ 1 & \omega^{-3} & 1 & \omega^3 & 1 & 1 \\ \omega^{-4} & \omega^{-5} & 1 & \omega^5 & \omega^4 & -1 \\ \omega^4 & \omega^5 & 1 & \omega^{-5} & \omega^{-4} & 1 \\ 1 & \omega^3 & 1 & \omega^{-3} & 1 & -1 \\ \omega^{-4} & \omega & 1 & \omega^{-1} & \omega^4 & 1 \\ \omega^4 & \omega^{-1} & 1 & \omega & \omega^{-4} & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

After the basis transformation, we can expand the spinless Hamiltonian around the Γ point

$$\begin{pmatrix} |-2\rangle & |-1\rangle & |0\rangle & |1\rangle & |2\rangle & |3\rangle \\ -\Delta \cos \theta & \hbar v_f^G k_+ & 0 & 0 & \Delta \sin \theta & 0 \\ \hbar v_f^G k_- & +\Delta \cos \theta & 0 & \Delta \sin \theta & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & t_1 + t_2 + t_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \Delta \sin \theta & 0 & -\Delta \cos \theta & -\hbar v_f^G k_- & 0 \\ \Delta \sin \theta & 0 & 0 & -\hbar v_f^G k_+ & +\Delta \cos \theta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -t_1 - t_2 - t_3 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

The physical meaning of those parameters have been explained in the main context.

With the spin degree of freedom, the Hamiltonian of graphene becomes

$$H_{tb}^s = \begin{pmatrix} H_{tb} & 0 \\ 0 & H_{tb} \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{B.4})$$

and the basis states expands to $\{|p_z, 1, \uparrow\rangle, |p_z, 2, \uparrow\rangle, |p_z, 3, \uparrow\rangle, |p_z, 4, \uparrow\rangle, |p_z, 5, \uparrow\rangle, |p_z, 6, \uparrow\rangle, |p_z, 1, \downarrow\rangle, |p_z, 2, \downarrow\rangle, |p_z, 3, \downarrow\rangle, |p_z, 4, \downarrow\rangle, |p_z, 5, \downarrow\rangle, |p_z, 6, \downarrow\rangle\}$. Next, a unitary transformation U is applied to the basis states and transforms the Hamiltonian as

$$H_{tb}^s \rightarrow U^\dagger H_{tb}^s U. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

The 12×12 transformation matrix U is chosen to be

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & \omega^{-3} & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & \omega^3 \\ \omega^{-4} & \omega^{-5} & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & \omega^4 & 0 & \omega^5 \\ \omega^4 & \omega^5 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & \omega^{-4} & 0 & \omega^{-5} \\ 1 & \omega^3 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 & \omega^{-3} \\ \omega^{-4} & \omega & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & \omega^4 & 0 & \omega^{-1} \\ \omega^4 & \omega^{-1} & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & \omega^{-4} & 0 & \omega \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & \omega^{-3} & 1 & \omega^3 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \omega^{-4} & 0 & \omega^{-5} & \omega^4 & \omega^5 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \omega^4 & 0 & \omega^5 & \omega^{-4} & \omega^{-5} & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & \omega^3 & 1 & \omega^{-3} & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \omega^{-4} & 0 & \omega & \omega^4 & \omega^{-1} & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \omega^4 & 0 & \omega^{-1} & \omega^{-4} & \omega & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

Expanding the transformed Hamiltonian around $\mathbf{k} = 0$ and excluding the energy levels far away from μ^G gives

$$H_{GG} = \mu^G + \begin{pmatrix} |\frac{3}{2}, +1\rangle & |-\frac{1}{2}, +1\rangle & |\frac{1}{2}, +1\rangle & |-\frac{3}{2}, +1\rangle & |-\frac{3}{2}, -1\rangle & |\frac{1}{2}, -1\rangle & |-\frac{1}{2}, -1\rangle & |\frac{3}{2}, -1\rangle \\ -\Delta\cos\theta & \hbar v_f^G k_+ & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \Delta\sin\theta \\ \hbar v_f^G k_- & +\Delta\cos\theta & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \Delta\sin\theta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\Delta\cos\theta & \hbar v_f^G k_+ & 0 & \Delta\sin\theta & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \hbar v_f^G k_- & +\Delta\cos\theta & \Delta\sin\theta & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \Delta\sin\theta & -\Delta\cos\theta & -\hbar v_f^G k_- & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \Delta\sin\theta & 0 & -\hbar v_f^G k_+ & +\Delta\cos\theta & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \Delta\sin\theta & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\Delta\cos\theta & -\hbar v_f^G k_- \\ \Delta\sin\theta & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\hbar v_f^G k_+ & +\Delta\cos\theta \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{B.7})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} |\frac{3}{2}, +1\rangle &= |L_z = 1, \eta = +1, \uparrow\rangle & |-\frac{1}{2}, +1\rangle &= |L_z = -1, \eta = +1, \uparrow\rangle \\ |\frac{1}{2}, +1\rangle &= |L_z = 1, \eta = +1, \downarrow\rangle & |-\frac{3}{2}, +1\rangle &= |L_z = -1, \eta = +1, \downarrow\rangle \\ |-\frac{3}{2}, -1\rangle &= |L_z = -1, \eta = -1, \downarrow\rangle & |\frac{1}{2}, -1\rangle &= |L_z = 1, \eta = -1, \downarrow\rangle \\ |-\frac{1}{2}, -1\rangle &= |L_z = -1, \eta = -1, \uparrow\rangle & |\frac{3}{2}, -1\rangle &= |L_z = 1, \eta = -1, \uparrow\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.8})$$

and

$$\begin{pmatrix} |L_z = 1, \eta = +1\rangle \\ |L_z = -1, \eta = +1\rangle \\ |L_z = 1, \eta = -1\rangle \\ |L_z = -1, \eta = -1\rangle \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \omega^{-4} & \omega^4 & 1 & \omega^{-4} & \omega^4 \\ \omega^{-3} & \omega^{-5} & \omega^5 & \omega^3 & \omega^1 & \omega^{-1} \\ \omega^3 & \omega^5 & \omega^{-5} & \omega^{-3} & \omega^{-1} & \omega^1 \\ 1 & \omega^4 & \omega^{-4} & 1 & \omega^4 & \omega^{-4} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} |p_z, 1\rangle \\ |p_z, 2\rangle \\ |p_z, 3\rangle \\ |p_z, 4\rangle \\ |p_z, 5\rangle \\ |p_z, 6\rangle \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{B.9})$$

J_z, L_z are the total angular momentum and orbital angular momentum of C_3 rotation in z direction respectively. $C_3|L_z, \eta\rangle = \omega^{-4L_z}|L_z, \eta\rangle$. The original K_0, K'_0 being folded onto the Γ

point gives rise to the additional index η . The details about the definition of the index η are in appendix C. The four states $|L_z = 0, \eta = \pm 1, \uparrow (\downarrow)\rangle$ are excluded because their energy levels are much further away from the Fermi level.

The surface states are described by H_{SS} :

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mu^S & i\hbar v_f^S k_- \\ -i\hbar v_f^S k_+ & \mu^S \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{B.10})$$

with the basis states:

$$|\pm \frac{1}{2}\rangle = \sum_{\alpha=Sb, Te} u_\alpha |\alpha, p_z, \uparrow (\downarrow)\rangle + v_\alpha |\alpha, p_\pm, \downarrow (\uparrow)\rangle \quad (\text{B.11})$$

where $|p_\pm\rangle = \mp \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|p_x\rangle \pm i|p_y\rangle)$ and u_α, v_α are assumed to be real.

The hybridization between p orbitals can be decoupled to two types ($V_{pp\pi}, V_{pp\sigma}$). In this case, the hybridization between p_z orbital of carbon atoms and $p_z / p_\pm$ orbital from α ($\alpha=\text{Te, Sb}$) is proportional to $V_{p_z}^\alpha / V_{p_\pm}^\alpha$ and we have the following decompositions:

$$\begin{aligned} V_{p_z}^\alpha &= V_\perp^\alpha = V_{pp\pi}^\alpha \sin^2 \theta^\alpha + V_{pp\sigma}^\alpha \cos^2 \theta^\alpha \\ V_{p_\pm}^\alpha &= \mp V_\parallel^\alpha e^{\pm i\varphi^\alpha} = \mp \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (V_{pp\sigma}^\alpha - V_{pp\pi}^\alpha) \cos \theta^\alpha \sin \theta^\alpha e^{\pm i\varphi^\alpha} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.12})$$

where θ^α stands for the angle between z axis and $\mathcal{L}^\alpha$, φ^α denotes the angle between the positive x axis and the projection of $\mathcal{L}^\alpha$ on the $x-y$ plane. Here $\mathcal{L}^\alpha$ denotes the vector connecting carbon atom and α atom and pointing to the carbon atom. For the hybridization submatrix H_{GS} , the sixteen terms have been deduced from real space tight-binding method (up to the order of $\mathbf{k}$):

$$\begin{aligned} -\langle -\frac{3}{2}, -1|H|-\frac{1}{2}\rangle^* &= \langle \frac{3}{2}, +1|H|\frac{1}{2}\rangle = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4} V_\perp^{Sb} u_{Sb} |\mathbf{a}_1| k_- \\ \langle -\frac{3}{2}, -1|H|\frac{1}{2}\rangle^* &= \langle \frac{3}{2}, +1|H|-\frac{1}{2}\rangle = 0 \\ -\langle \frac{1}{2}, -1|H|-\frac{1}{2}\rangle^* &= \langle -\frac{1}{2}, +1|H|\frac{1}{2}\rangle = \frac{\sqrt{6}}{4} V_\perp^{Sb} u_{Sb} |\mathbf{a}_1| k_+ \\ -\langle \frac{1}{2}, -1|H|\frac{1}{2}\rangle^* &= \langle -\frac{1}{2}, +1|H|-\frac{1}{2}\rangle = -\sqrt{6}i V_\parallel^{Te} v_{Te} + \frac{\sqrt{6}i}{2} V_\parallel^{Sb} v_{Sb} \\ -\langle -\frac{1}{2}, -1|H|-\frac{1}{2}\rangle^* &= \langle \frac{1}{2}, +1|H|\frac{1}{2}\rangle = -\frac{3\sqrt{2}i}{2} V_\parallel^{Sb} v_{Sb} \\ -\langle -\frac{1}{2}, -1|H|\frac{1}{2}\rangle^* &= \langle \frac{1}{2}, +1|H|-\frac{1}{2}\rangle = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4} V_\perp^{Sb} u_{Sb} |\mathbf{a}_1| k_- \\ \langle \frac{3}{2}, -1|H|-\frac{1}{2}\rangle^* &= \langle -\frac{3}{2}, +1|H|\frac{1}{2}\rangle = -\frac{\sqrt{2}i}{2} V_\parallel^{Sb} v_{Sb} |\mathbf{a}_1| k_- \\ -\langle \frac{3}{2}, -1|H|\frac{1}{2}\rangle^* &= \langle -\frac{3}{2}, +1|H|-\frac{1}{2}\rangle = \frac{\sqrt{6}}{4} V_\perp^{Sb} u_{Sb} |\mathbf{a}_1| k_+ \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.13})$$

where $\langle \psi'_1 | H(\mathbf{k}) | \psi'_2 \rangle = \langle \psi_1 | T^{-1} H(\mathbf{k}) T | \psi_2 \rangle = \langle \psi_1 | H^*(-\mathbf{k}) | \psi_2 \rangle$ is used. Two examples of the

above calculations are

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \frac{3}{2}, +1 | H | \frac{1}{2} \rangle &= \langle L_z = 1, \eta = +1, \uparrow | H | \frac{1}{2} \rangle \\
&= \sum_{\alpha} u_{\alpha} \langle L_z = 1, \eta = +1, \uparrow | H | \alpha, p_z, \uparrow \rangle \\
&= \sum_{\alpha, n} u_{\alpha} c_n^* \langle p_z, n, \uparrow | H | \alpha, p_z, \uparrow \rangle \\
&= u_{Te} V_{\perp}^{Te} (1 + \omega^4 + \omega^{-4} + 1 + \omega^4 + \omega^{-4}) / \sqrt{6} \\
&\quad + u_{Sb} V_{\perp}^{Sb} [(1 + \omega^4) e^{-i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{a}_1} + (\omega^{-4} + 1) e^{-i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{a}_2} + (\omega^4 + \omega^{-4})] / \sqrt{6} \\
&= \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4} u_{Sb} V_{\perp}^{Sb} |\mathbf{a}_1| k_{-}
\end{aligned} \tag{B.14}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \frac{3}{2}, +1 | H | -\frac{1}{2} \rangle &= \langle L_z = 1, \eta = +1, \uparrow | H | -\frac{1}{2} \rangle \\
&= \sum_{\alpha} v_{\alpha} \langle L_z = 1, \eta = +1, \uparrow | H | \alpha, p_{-}, \uparrow \rangle \\
&= \sum_{\alpha, n} u_{\alpha} c_n^* \langle p_z, n, \uparrow | H | \alpha, p_{-}, \uparrow \rangle \\
&= v_{Te} V_{\parallel}^{Te} (1 \cdot \omega^6 + \omega^4 \cdot \omega^4 + \omega^{-4} \cdot \omega^2 + 1 + \omega^4 \cdot \omega^{-2} + \omega^{-4} \cdot \omega^{-4}) / \sqrt{6} \\
&\quad + v_{Sb} V_{\parallel}^{Sb} [(1 \cdot \omega^{-2} + \omega^4) e^{-i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{a}_1} + (\omega^{-4} \cdot \omega^{-6} + 1 \cdot \omega^{-4}) e^{-i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{a}_2} \\
&\quad + (\omega^4 \cdot \omega^2 + \omega^{-4} \cdot \omega^4)] / \sqrt{6} \\
&= 0
\end{aligned} \tag{B.15}$$

where the hybridization is limited between states with the same spin and the transformation $|\frac{3}{2}, +1\rangle = \sum_n c_n |p_z, n, \uparrow\rangle$ in Eq. [B.8] and Eq. [B.9] is used. The complete Hamiltonian H_{GS} for the coupling between graphene and topological surface states of Sb_2Te_3 films is written as

$$\begin{pmatrix}
\frac{\sqrt{2}}{4} V_{\perp}^{Sb} u_{Sb} |\mathbf{a}_1| k_{-} & 0 \\
\frac{\sqrt{6}}{4} V_{\perp}^{Sb} u_{Sb} |\mathbf{a}_1| k_{+} & -\sqrt{6} i V_{\parallel}^{Te} v_{Te} + \frac{\sqrt{6} i}{2} V_{\parallel}^{Sb} v_{Sb} \\
-\frac{3\sqrt{2} i}{2} V_{\parallel}^{Sb} v_{Sb} & \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4} V_{\perp}^{Sb} u_{Sb} |\mathbf{a}_1| k_{-} \\
-\frac{\sqrt{2} i}{2} V_{\parallel}^{Sb} v_{Sb} |\mathbf{a}_1| k_{-} & \frac{\sqrt{6}}{4} V_{\perp}^{Sb} u_{Sb} |\mathbf{a}_1| k_{+} \\
0 & -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{4} V_{\perp}^{Sb} u_{Sb} |\mathbf{a}_1| k_{+} \\
-\sqrt{6} i V_{\parallel}^{Te} v_{Te} + \frac{\sqrt{6} i}{2} V_{\parallel}^{Sb} v_{Sb} & -\frac{\sqrt{6}}{4} V_{\perp}^{Sb} u_{Sb} |\mathbf{a}_1| k_{-} \\
-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{4} V_{\perp}^{Sb} u_{Sb} |\mathbf{a}_1| k_{+} & -\frac{3\sqrt{2} i}{2} V_{\parallel}^{Sb} v_{Sb} \\
-\frac{\sqrt{6}}{4} V_{\perp}^{Sb} u_{Sb} |\mathbf{a}_1| k_{-} & \frac{\sqrt{2} i}{2} V_{\parallel}^{Sb} v_{Sb} |\mathbf{a}_1| k_{+}
\end{pmatrix}. \tag{B.16}$$

Now all the terms in H_{GG} , H_{SS} and H_{GS} have been explicitly shown and the parameters in them can be determined by fitting the the *ab initio* band structure, as listed in the Table B.1.

μ^G (eV)	0.008
μ^S (eV)	-0.041
v_f^G (m.s ⁻¹)	0.777×10^6
v_f^S (m.s ⁻¹)	0.278×10^6
Δ (eV)	0.010
θ	2.904
$V_{\perp}^{Sb}{}_{USb}$ (eV)	-0.141
$V_{\parallel}^{Te}{}_{vTe}$ (eV)	0.014
$V_{\parallel}^{Sb}{}_{vSb}$ (eV)	-0.005

TABLE B.1: Fitting parameters of the effective Hamiltonian H_{full} in Eq. [2] for the *ab initio* band structure in Fig. [1].

C. Definition of the index η

For a pristine graphene with atom 1 and 2 in the primitive cell in Fig. 1(b), the eigenstates of the Hamiltonian at the Dirac point ($|K\rangle$ and $|K'\rangle$) should take the form of

$$\begin{pmatrix} c_1 \\ c_2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (C.1)$$

with the basis being $\{|p_z, 1\rangle, |p_z, 2\rangle\}$. If we enlarge the basis set to $\{|p_z, 1\rangle, |p_z, 2\rangle, |p_z, 3\rangle, |p_z, 4\rangle, |p_z, 5\rangle, |p_z, 6\rangle\}$, according to Bloch theorem, the eigenstates at $k = K, K'$ become

$$\begin{pmatrix} c_1 \\ c_2 \\ c_1\omega^4 \\ c_2\omega^{-4} \\ c_1\omega^{-4} \\ c_2\omega^4 \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow K, \quad \begin{pmatrix} c_2\omega^4 \\ c_1 \\ c_2 \\ c_1\omega^4 \\ c_2\omega^{-4} \\ c_1\omega^{-4} \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow K' \quad (C.2)$$

where $\omega = \exp(\frac{i\pi}{6})$. These two states be represented by $|K, c_1, c_2\rangle$ and $|K', c_1, c_2\rangle$ respectively and $|K', c_1, c_2\rangle = C_6|K, c_1, c_2\rangle$. More importantly, we notice that

$$\begin{aligned} C_3|K, 1, 0\rangle &= \omega^{-4}|K, 1, 0\rangle, & C_3|K', 1, 0\rangle &= \omega^{-4}|K', 1, 0\rangle \\ C_3|K, 0, 1\rangle &= \omega^4|K, 0, 1\rangle, & C_3|K', 0, 1\rangle &= \omega^4|K', 0, 1\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (C.3)$$

The states $|K(K'), 1, 0\rangle$ are eigenstates of C_3 rotation operator with the orbital angular momentum in z direction L_z being $+1$, while $|K(K'), 0, 1\rangle$ correspond to L_z being -1 . According to the definitions of $|K(K'), c_1, c_2\rangle$ in Eq. [C.2], $|K(K'), 1, 0\rangle$ are projections of $|K(K')\rangle$ on the sublattice containing atom 1 and $|K(K'), 0, 1\rangle$ are projections of $|K(K')\rangle$ on the sublattice containing atom 2. To classify the doubly degenerate states at K, K' further, we introduce C_6 , the six-fold rotation operator. And we find

$$\begin{aligned} C_6(|K, 1, 0\rangle + \omega^{-4}|K', 1, 0\rangle) &= \omega^4(|K, 1, 0\rangle + \omega^{-4}|K', 1, 0\rangle) = \omega^4|C_6, L'_z = -2\rangle \\ C_6(\omega^3|K, 1, 0\rangle + \omega^5|K', 1, 0\rangle) &= \omega^{-2}(\omega^3|K, 1, 0\rangle + \omega^5|K', 1, 0\rangle) = \omega^{-2}|C_6, L'_z = 1\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (C.4)$$

In the graphene/Sb₂Te₃ hetero-junction, the C_3 rotation symmetry is preserved but C_6 rotation symmetry is broken. So to take advantage of the classifications above, we introduce an additional index η and set

$$|L_z = 1, \eta = +1\rangle = |C_6, L'_z = -2\rangle, \quad |L_z = 1, \eta = -1\rangle = |C_6, L'_z = 1\rangle \quad (C.5)$$

The situation of the states $|K(K'), 0, 1\rangle$ is similar.

$$\begin{aligned} C_6(\omega^{-5}|K, 0, 1\rangle + \omega^5|K', 0, 1\rangle) &= \omega^2(\omega^{-5}|K, 0, 1\rangle + \omega^5|K', 0, 1\rangle) = \omega^2|C_6, L'_z = -1\rangle \\ C_6(\omega^4|K, 0, 1\rangle + \omega^{-4}|K', 0, 1\rangle) &= \omega^{-4}(\omega^4|K, 0, 1\rangle + \omega^{-4}|K', 0, 1\rangle) = \omega^{-4}|C_6, L'_z = 2\rangle \quad (\text{C.6}) \\ |L_z = -1, \eta = +1\rangle &= |C_6, L'_z = -1\rangle, \quad |L_z = -1, \eta = -1\rangle = |C_6, L'_z = 2\rangle \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to check that the definitions of $|L_z, \eta\rangle$ here in Eq. [C.5] and Eq. [C.6] are consistent with those in Eq. [B.9]. To sum up, the electron state $|L_z, \eta\rangle$ is an eigenstate of C_6 rotation operator and also a linear supercomposition of $|K\rangle$ projected on one sublattice and $|K'\rangle$ projected on the other sublattice. According to the definitions above, the time-reversal operation changes the sign of both L_z and η .

D. Possible coupling processes between $|\frac{1}{2}, -1\rangle$ and $|\frac{1}{2}, +1\rangle$

The spin-flip coupling process should include the coupling between these graphene states with the topological surface states $|\pm\frac{1}{2}\rangle$, which can be decomposed into p orbitals of Sb and Te atoms as in Eq. [B.11]. Bearing the decompositions in mind, we have the following perturbative terms that produce linear momentum dependence (the energy difference in the denominator is assumed to be constant and ignored)

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \frac{1}{2}, 1 | H | \alpha, p_+, \downarrow \rangle \langle \alpha, p_+, \downarrow | H | -\frac{1}{2}, -1 \rangle \propto k_- \\ &\underline{\langle \frac{1}{2}, 1 | H | \alpha, p_z, \uparrow \rangle \langle \alpha, p_z, \uparrow | H | -\frac{1}{2}, -1 \rangle} \propto k_- \\ &\underline{\langle \frac{1}{2}, 1 | H | \alpha, p_-, \uparrow \rangle \langle \alpha, p_-, \uparrow | H | -\frac{1}{2}, -1 \rangle} \propto k_- \\ &\underline{\langle \frac{1}{2}, 1 | H | \alpha, p_z, \downarrow \rangle \langle \alpha, p_z, \downarrow | H | -\frac{1}{2}, -1 \rangle} \propto k_- \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.1})$$

with $\alpha = Te, Sb$ for TIs. Here the first two terms are from $\langle \frac{1}{2}, 1 | H | J_z^S = \frac{1}{2} \rangle \langle J_z^S = \frac{1}{2} | H | -\frac{1}{2}, 1 \rangle$ and the last two are from $\langle \frac{1}{2}, 1 | H | J_z^S = -\frac{1}{2} \rangle \langle J_z^S = -\frac{1}{2} | H | -\frac{1}{2}, 1 \rangle$. The underlined terms, proportional to k_- , involve the spin-flip hopping between graphene and TI. Therefore, only second order (or higher order) perturbation processes can give rise to the linear momentum dependence and that is why the Fermi velocity of the resulting state is much smaller than that of the TI surface states.

E. Mean field theory for “heavy” Dirac fermions with interaction

Based on the third order Löwdin perturbation theory³¹, we obtain the effective Hamiltonian near the Γ point

$$\begin{aligned} H_D &= \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{C}_1 k_x k_y^2 - C_1 k_x^3 & iC_2 k^2 k_- + iC_3 k_- \\ -iC_2 k^2 k_+ - iC_3 k_+ & -\tilde{C}_1 k_x k_y^2 + C_1 k_x^3 \end{pmatrix} \\ &\quad + (e_0 - C_0 k^2) I_{2 \times 2} \\ &= (C_2 k^2 + C_3) \hat{z} \cdot (\sigma \times \mathbf{k}) - \frac{C_1}{2} (k_+^3 + k_-^3) \sigma_z \\ &\quad + (e_0 - C_0 k^2) I_{2 \times 2} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.1})$$

where $C_0 = 116.1186$ eV, $\tilde{C}_1 = 96.7254$ eV, $C_1 = 32.2418$ eV, $C_2 = 936.4909$ eV, $C_3 = 0.02039$ eV. In the H_{eff} , we have set lattice constant $a = 1$ and $k_{x,y}$ is dimensionless. We have made

use of the fact that $\tilde{C}_1 = 3C_1$, and found a term $-\frac{C_1}{2}(k_+^3 + k_-^3)\sigma_z$ to be exactly the hexagon wrapping term in Sb_2Te_3 . e_0 is changed to be zero for simplicity. H_{eff} indeed captures the correct physics in the vicinity of Γ point. The higher order perturbation included, the better H_D performs. In our case, it is reasonable to include perturbations up to the third order.

Before considering the interaction effects, it is advisable to first look at the possible mass terms to H_D . Consider a general mass term $M = \sum_{i \in (x,y,z)} m_i \sigma_i$,

$$\begin{aligned} H_D &= ((C_2 k^2 + C_3)k_y + m_x)\sigma_x + (m_y - (C_2 k^2 + C_3)k_x)\sigma_y \\ &\quad + (\tilde{C}_1 k_x k_y^2 - C_1 k_x^3 + m_z)\sigma_z \\ E_k &= \pm [((C_2 k^2 + C_3)k_y + m_x)^2 + (m_y - (C_2 k^2 + C_3)k_x)^2 \\ &\quad + (\tilde{C}_1 k_x k_y^2 - C_1 k_x^3 + m_z)^2]^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.2})$$

where the identity term $C_0 k^2 I_{2 \times 2}$ is ignored. When $m_x = m_y = 0$, $m_z \sigma_z$ is obviously a mass term. When $m_y = m_z = 0$, being gapless requires $k_x = 0$ and the energy dispersion is

$$E_g^x = 2[(C_2 k_y^2 + C_3)k_y + m_x] \quad (\text{E.3})$$

So we could always find a possible k_y , where $E_g^x = 0$ when $k_x = 0$. When $m_x = m_z = 0$, being gapless requires $k_y = 0$ and the corresponding eigen energy becomes

$$E_g^y = 2\sqrt{(m_y - (C_2 k_x^2 + C_3)k_x)^2 + (C_1 k_x^3)^2}. \quad (\text{E.4})$$

In this case, we cannot find a gapless point in the band structure. Thus, the general form for the mass terms should be $M = m_y \sigma_y + m_z \sigma_z$.

We consider an onsite Hubbard repulsion,

$$H = \sum_{\langle r, r' \rangle} \Psi^\dagger(r) H_0(r, r') \Psi(r') + U \sum_r \psi_1^\dagger(r) \psi_1(r) \psi_2^\dagger(r) \psi_2(r) \quad (\text{E.5})$$

Here we have defined real space basis $\Psi^\dagger(r) = (\psi_1^\dagger(r), \psi_2^\dagger(r))$, and a real space Hamiltonian $H(r, r') = H(r - r')$ related to our effective Hamiltonian via Fourier transformation

$$H_0 = \sum_{\langle r, r' \rangle} c_r^\dagger H(r, r') c_{r'} = \sum_k c_k^\dagger c_k H_{eff}(k). \quad (\text{E.6})$$

Based on previous mass terms analysis, we expect interaction-induced mass terms to be proportional to σ_y and σ_z . Such mass terms will naturally arise if we consider the following decomposition scheme to the four-fermion interaction:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_1^\dagger \psi_1 \psi_2^\dagger \psi_2 &= (\psi_1^\dagger \psi_1)(\psi_2^\dagger \psi_2) - (\psi_1^\dagger \psi_2)(\psi_2^\dagger \psi_1) \\ &= \textcircled{1} - \textcircled{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.7})$$

We define the following order parameters:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_0 &= \langle \psi_1^\dagger \psi_2 \rangle = \delta e^{i\theta} \\ \delta_0^* &= \langle \psi_2^\dagger \psi_1 \rangle = \delta e^{-i\theta} \\ \delta_1 &= \langle \psi_1^\dagger \psi_1 \rangle \\ \delta_2 &= \langle \psi_2^\dagger \psi_2 \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.8})$$

and we could perform the mean field theory based on the above order parameters,

$$\begin{aligned}
\textcircled{1} &= (\psi_1^\dagger \psi_1 - \delta_1 + \delta_1)(\psi_2^\dagger \psi_2 - \delta_2 + \delta_2) \\
&= -\delta_1 \delta_2 + \psi_1^\dagger \psi_1 \delta_2 + \psi_2^\dagger \psi_2 \delta_1 \\
&= -\delta_1 \delta_2 + \Psi^\dagger \begin{pmatrix} \delta_2 & 0 \\ 0 & \delta_1 \end{pmatrix} \Psi \\
&= A^{-2} \frac{m_z^2 - m_0^2}{4} + A^{-1} \Psi^\dagger \begin{pmatrix} \frac{m_0 - m_z}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{m_z + m_0}{2} \end{pmatrix} \Psi \\
&= (A^{-2} \frac{m_z^2}{4} - A^{-1} \frac{m_z \Psi^\dagger \sigma_z \Psi}{2}) - (A^{-2} \frac{m_0^2}{4} - A^{-1} \frac{m_0 \Psi^\dagger \sigma_0 \Psi}{2}). \tag{E.9}
\end{aligned}$$

Here we have introduced the area of the system A to make order parameters dimensionless.

$$\begin{aligned}
A^{-1} m_z &= \delta_1 - \delta_2 = \langle \Psi^\dagger \sigma_z \Psi \rangle \\
A^{-1} m_0 &= \delta_1 + \delta_2 = \langle \Psi^\dagger \sigma_0 \Psi \rangle. \tag{E.10}
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
\textcircled{2} &= (\psi_1^\dagger \psi_2 - \delta_0 + \delta_0)(\psi_2^\dagger \psi_1 - \delta_0^* + \delta_0^*) \\
&= -|\delta_0|^2 + \psi_1^\dagger \psi_2 \delta_0^* + \psi_2^\dagger \psi_1 \delta_0 \\
&= -|\delta_0|^2 + \Psi^\dagger \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \delta_0^* \\ \delta_0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \Psi \\
&= -|\delta_0|^2 + \Psi^\dagger (\delta_0 \cos \theta \sigma_x + \delta_0 \sin \theta \sigma_y) \Psi \\
&= -A^{-2} \frac{m_x^2 + m_y^2}{4} + A^{-1} \Psi^\dagger \left(\frac{m_x}{2} \sigma_x + \frac{m_y}{2} \sigma_y \right) \Psi, \tag{E.11}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have defined

$$\begin{aligned}
A^{-1} m_x &= \delta_0 + \delta_0^* = \langle \psi_1^\dagger \psi_2 + \psi_2^\dagger \psi_1 \rangle = \langle \Psi^\dagger \sigma_x \Psi \rangle \\
A^{-1} m_y &= \frac{\delta_0 - \delta_0^*}{i} = \langle -i \psi_1^\dagger \psi_2 + i \psi_2^\dagger \psi_1 \rangle = \langle \Psi^\dagger \sigma_y \Psi \rangle. \tag{E.12}
\end{aligned}$$

In the previous section, we have shown that only mass terms that couples to either σ_z or σ_y will gap the system. So we will consider the contributions from order m_z and m_y . In the mean field approximation, we write down the Hamiltonian and Fourier transform it into momentum space,

$$\begin{aligned}
H &= \sum_k \Psi^\dagger(k) H_{eff}(k) \Psi(k) + U \sum_r [\textcircled{1} - \textcircled{2}] \\
&= \sum_k \Psi^\dagger(k) H_{eff}(k) \Psi(k) - \frac{U}{2A} \sum_r \Psi^\dagger(r) (m_y \sigma_y + m_z \sigma_z) \Psi(r) \\
&\quad + \frac{U}{4A} (m_y^2 + m_z^2) \\
&= \sum_k \Psi^\dagger(k) [H_{eff}(k) - \frac{U}{2A} (m_y \sigma_y + m_z \sigma_z)] \Psi(k) + \frac{U}{4A} (m_y^2 + m_z^2) \\
&= \sum_k \Psi^\dagger(k) [H_{eff}(k) - \frac{U}{2} (m_y \sigma_y + m_z \sigma_z)] \Psi(k) + \frac{U}{4} (m_y^2 + m_z^2). \tag{E.13}
\end{aligned}$$

Here we have redefined $U \rightarrow U \times A$ and the new U has the dimension of energy. The above mass terms obviously both break time reversal symmetry, and thus gap the surface states. A

difference between the two mass terms is that $m_y\sigma_y$ breaks three fold rotation symmetry C_3 , while $m_z\sigma_z$ preserves C_3 symmetry. Therefore, $m_y\sigma_y$ leads to a nematic phase. If the system is in this nematic regime, such nematic ordering could be detected via scanning tunneling microscopy (STM) measurement. In general, both terms here will gap the surface states and result in the spontaneous half quantum hall state on the surface.

F. Critical interaction solution for self-consistent equations

The zero temperature free energy F is

$$\begin{aligned} F &= \frac{U}{4}(m_y^2 + m_z^2) - \sum_k \sqrt{d_x(k)^2 + (d_y(k) - \frac{U}{2}m_y)^2 + (d_z(k) - \frac{U}{2}m_z)^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{U}(\Delta_y^2 + \Delta_z^2) - \sum_k \sqrt{d_x(k)^2 + (d_y(k) - \Delta_y)^2 + (d_z(k) - \Delta_z)^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.1})$$

where $\Delta_{y,z} = \frac{U}{2}m_{y,z}$. Self-consistent equations for order parameter Δ_i ($i = y, z$) can be obtained by minimizing F :

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{\partial F}{\partial \Delta_i} \\ &= \frac{2}{U}\Delta_i - \sum_k \frac{\Delta_i - d_i}{\sqrt{d_x(k)^2 + (d_y(k) - \Delta_y)^2 + (d_z(k) - \Delta_z)^2}} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.2})$$

In two dimensions, the density of states (DOS) for a linear dispersion at the Dirac point is vanishing, but DOS for a cubic dispersion is diverging. Thus, in the presence of interactions, systems with a linear dispersion require finite interaction strength to develop ordering, while systems with a cubic dispersion will develop instabilities. In our system, there is an interesting competition between linear terms and cubic terms. When linear term is vanishingly small, we expect the system will spontaneously develop TR breaking ordering (m_y and m_z). As we increase the linear term, the critical interaction required to develop the above order parameters also increases. To verify our expectation, we aim at finding a relation between critical interaction U_c and linear coefficient C_3 , while leaving the cubic coefficient C_2 fixed. Recall that the critical interaction happens when the limit $\Delta_i \rightarrow 0$ takes place.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{U_c} &= \frac{1}{2} \lim_{\Delta_{y,z} \rightarrow 0} \sum_k \frac{1}{\sqrt{d_x(k)^2 + (d_y(k) - \Delta_y)^2 + (d_z(k) - \Delta_z)^2}} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \lim_{\Delta_{y,z} \rightarrow 0} \frac{\sum_k \frac{d_i(k)}{\sqrt{d_x(k)^2 + (d_y(k) - \Delta_y)^2 + (d_z(k) - \Delta_z)^2}}}{\Delta_i} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.3})$$

In the above equation, the first limit is easy to evaluate. For the second limit, the denominator $\Delta_i \rightarrow 0$, and meanwhile, the numerator also approaches zero under this limit, because $\frac{d_i(k)}{\sqrt{d_x(k)^2 + (d_y(k) - \Delta_y)^2 + (d_z(k) - \Delta_z)^2}}$ is an odd function in k_i . Therefore, this limit is a “ $\frac{0}{0}$ ” type

limit, which can be evaluated with the help of the L'Hospital's rule:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{\Delta_{y,z} \rightarrow 0} \frac{\sum_k \frac{d_i(k)}{\sqrt{d_x(k)^2 + (d_y(k) - \Delta_y)^2 + (d_z(k) - \Delta_z)^2}}}{\Delta_i} \\
&= \lim_{\Delta_{y,z} \rightarrow 0} \frac{\sum_k \frac{d}{d\Delta_i} \left[\frac{d_i(k)}{\sqrt{d_x(k)^2 + (d_y(k) - \Delta_y)^2 + (d_z(k) - \Delta_z)^2}} \right]}{\frac{d}{d\Delta_i} \Delta_i} \\
&= \lim_{\Delta_{y,z} \rightarrow 0} \sum_k \frac{d_i(k)(d_i(k) - \Delta_i)}{[d_x(k)^2 + (d_y(k) - \Delta_y)^2 + (d_z(k) - \Delta_z)^2]^{\frac{3}{2}}} \\
&= \sum_k \frac{d_i(k)^2}{[d_x(k)^2 + d_y(k)^2 + d_z(k)^2]^{\frac{3}{2}}}. \tag{F.4}
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we arrived at the analytical expression of critical interaction strength U_c :

$$\frac{1}{U_c} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{d_x(k)^2 + d_y(k)^2 + d_z(k)^2}} - \frac{d_i(k)^2}{[d_x(k)^2 + d_y(k)^2 + d_z(k)^2]^{\frac{3}{2}}} \right]. \tag{F.5}$$

In the continuum limit,

$$\frac{1}{U_c A} = \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^2 k}{(2\pi)^2} \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{d_x(k)^2 + d_y(k)^2 + d_z(k)^2}} - \frac{d_i(k)^2}{[d_x(k)^2 + d_y(k)^2 + d_z(k)^2]^{\frac{3}{2}}} \right], \tag{F.6}$$

where A is the area of the sample and the calculation of the k-space integral involves a choice of momentum cut-off Λ .

* Electronic address: e-mail: cxl56@psu.edu

- ¹ Y. Zhang, Y.-W. Tan, H. L. Stormer, and P. Kim, *Nature* **438**, 201 (2005).
- ² K. Novoselov, A. K. Geim, S. Morozov, D. Jiang, M. Katsnelson, I. Grigorieva, S. Dubonos, and A. Firsov, *Nature* **438**, 197 (2005).
- ³ A. C. Neto, F. Guinea, N. Peres, K. S. Novoselov, and A. K. Geim, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81**, 109 (2009).
- ⁴ M. Z. Hasan and C. L. Kane, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **82**, 3045 (2010).
- ⁵ X.-L. Qi and S.-C. Zhang, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **83**, 1057 (2011).
- ⁶ J. E. Moore, *Nature* **464**, 194 (2010).
- ⁷ P. R. Wallace, *Phys. Rev.* **71**, 622 (1947).
- ⁸ P. Avouris, *Nano Letters* **10**, 4285 (2010).
- ⁹ S. Das Sarma, S. Adam, E. H. Hwang, and E. Rossi, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **83**, 407 (2011).
- ¹⁰ K. S. Novoselov, V. Fal, L. Colombo, P. Gellert, M. Schwab, K. Kim, et al., *Nature* **490**, 192 (2012).
- ¹¹ R. Jackiw, *Phys. Rev. D* **29**, 2375 (1984).
- ¹² F. D. M. Haldane, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **61**, 2015 (1988).
- ¹³ C. L. Kane and E. J. Mele, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 226801 (2005).
- ¹⁴ S. Raghu, X.-L. Qi, C. Honerkamp, and S.-C. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 156401 (2008).
- ¹⁵ L. Kou, B. Yan, F. Hu, S.-C. Wu, T. O. Wehling, C. Felser, C. Chen, and T. Frauenheim, *Nano Letters* **13**, 6251 (2013).
- ¹⁶ K.-H. Jin and S.-H. Jhi, *Phys. Rev. B* **87**, 075442 (2013).
- ¹⁷ R. W. G. Wyckoff and R. W. Wyckoff, *Crystal structures*, vol. 2 (New York, 1960).
- ¹⁸ C.-Y. Hou, C. Chamon, and C. Mudry, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 186809 (2007).
- ¹⁹ Y. Yao, F. Ye, X.-L. Qi, S.-C. Zhang, and Z. Fang, *Phys. Rev. B* **75**, 041401 (2007).
- ²⁰ S. Zhou, G.-H. Gweon, J. Graf, A. Fedorov, C. Spataru, R. Diehl, Y. Kopelevich, D.-H. Lee, S. G. Louie, and A. Lanzara, *Nature physics* **2**, 595 (2006).
- ²¹ Y. Chen, J. Analytis, J.-H. Chu, Z. Liu, S.-K. Mo, X.-L. Qi, H. Zhang, D. Lu, X. Dai, Z. Fang, et al., *Science* **325**, 178 (2009).

- ²² Y. Xia, D. Qian, D. Hsieh, L. Wray, A. Pal, H. Lin, A. Bansil, D. Grauer, Y. Hor, R. Cava, et al., Nature Physics **5**, 398 (2009).
- ²³ P. Roushan, J. Seo, C. V. Parker, Y. Hor, D. Hsieh, D. Qian, A. Richardella, M. Z. Hasan, R. Cava, and A. Yazdani, Nature **460**, 1106 (2009).
- ²⁴ T. Zhang, P. Cheng, X. Chen, J.-F. Jia, X. Ma, K. He, L. Wang, H. Zhang, X. Dai, Z. Fang, et al., Physical Review Letters **103**, 266803 (2009).
- ²⁵ X.-L. Qi, T. L. Hughes, and S.-C. Zhang, Physical Review B **78**, 195424 (2008).
- ²⁶ A. M. Essin, J. E. Moore, and D. Vanderbilt, Physical review letters **102**, 146805 (2009).
- ²⁷ P. E. Blöchl, Phys. Rev. B **50**, 17953 (1994).
- ²⁸ G. Kresse and D. Joubert, Phys. Rev. B **59**, 1758 (1999).
- ²⁹ G. Kresse and J. Furthmüller, Phys. Rev. B **54**, 11169 (1996).
- ³⁰ S. Grimme, Journal of computational chemistry **27**, 1787 (2006).
- ³¹ R. Winkler, *Spin-orbit coupling effects in two-dimensional electron and hole systems* (2003).